



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,157	09/26/2006	Ian Alastair Kirk	ZQ120/07001	7042
22884	7590	06/21/2011	EXAMINER	
MIDDLETON & REUTLINGER			FULLER, ROBERT EDWARD	
2500 BROWN & WILLIAMSON TOWER				
(401 S. 4th Street, Suite 2500)			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LOUISVILLE, KY 40202			3676	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/21/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTOmail@MiddReut.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/594,157	KIRK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ROBERT E. FULLER	3676	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2011.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,5,7-10,13-37 and 40-45 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,5,7-10,13-37 and 40-45 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 8, 2011 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 2, 7-10, 13-33, 35-37, and 40-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buttolph (US 2,589,534) in view of DeBray et al. (US 6,032,748).

With regard to claims 1, 35, 36, 44, and 45, Buttolph discloses an apparatus for mobilizing drill cuttings in a well, the apparatus comprising a sleeve (13), at least one vane (28) provided on the sleeve, the sleeve having a bearing region (i.e. its outer surface proximate numeral 41), at least one bushing (14) that is rotatably mounted on the bearing region of the sleeve, at least two blades (51) mounted on the bushing, the at least two blades defining at least one fluid conduit between adjacent blades, the blades and vane being rotatable relative to one another (column 5, lines 64-71).

Buttolph discloses the wear sleeve being threadedly connected to the drill string, and fails to disclose the sleeve being split along at least one side, such that it clamps around the drill string.

DeBray et al. disclose an apparatus similar to that of Buttolph, having a wear sleeve (26) clamped around a drill string, the sleeve also having a bearing region on which a bushing (50) is rotatably mounted.

It would have been considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified Buttolph such that the sleeve was split and clamped around the drill pipe, rather than threadedly attached, in order to enable the sleeve to be connected to the drill pipe "at most any location along the string" (DeBray et al., column 4, lines 26-28), rather than being constrained to only the areas which had threads.

With further regard to claim 35, in the combination of Buttolph and DeBray et al., the apparatus is clamped to the tubular by virtue of the sleeve itself being a clamp. With further regard to claim 45, Buttolph discloses an annular clamp (i.e. upper collar 11).

With regard to claims 2 and 37, since Buttolph discloses vanes and blades which are relatively rotatable, then Buttolph's apparatus will create a pressure difference in a fluid flowing past the vanes and blades.

With regard to claims 7, 9, 29, and 30, Buttolph discloses the vanes being parallel to the axis of rotation, while the blades are offset from the axis. Therefore, Buttolph fails to disclose the blades being parallel and vanes being offset. Buttolph also fails to disclose the specific angle of offset. Furthermore, Buttolph fails to disclose the vanes and blades being offset in opposite directions.

It would have been considered obvious to modify Buttolph to offset the vanes, rather than the blades, as this would have amounted to the mere reversal of the parts of Buttolph. It also would have been considered obvious to offset the vanes and blades in opposite directions, as this type of configuration was well known for creating upward thrust and turbulence in the wellbore, and therefore would have yielded predictable results. See Yancey for example, which shows offset vanes and parallel blades. See also US 2,352,412 to Sandstone, which shows oppositely offset vanes and blades. Finally, it would have been considered obvious to offset the blades of Buttolph by 3-10 degrees, as it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable (i.e. the offset angle) involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

With regard to claim 8, Buttolph's blades extend helically (see Fig. 5).

With regard to claim 10, Buttolph discloses an annular clamp (i.e. upper collar 11) around the outside of the sleeve (i.e. in close proximity of the outside) and engaging an outer surface of the sleeve (i.e. the upper annular shoulder surface—see Fig. 5).

With regard to claims 13, 14, 40, and 41, in combination, Buttolph and DeBray et al. teach the vanes rotating with the drill string (as the wear sleeve in DeBray et al. is tightly clamped to the drill string via bushings 16 and 18).

With regard to claims 15-19, 27, 28, and 31-33, Buttolph fails to disclose the claimed shapes of the blades and vanes. However, these shapes are all well known, as shown by US 4,676,716 and US 3,882,946 (asymmetrical foil-shaped blades—Fig. 3, 4, 9, and 10), US 6,056,073 (scooped, concave vanes), and US 5,074,356 (sinusoidal vanes—Fig. 1). It would have been considered obvious to one of ordinary skill to have used anyone of the claimed blade/vane shapes, as this would have been a matter of simple substitution of one known blade shape for another, and furthermore because has been held that a change in the shape of a prior art device is a design consideration within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966).

With regard to claim 20, Buttolph discloses a rigid bushing, since it is made of metal.

With regard to claim 21, Buttolph's sleeve is annular, and accommodates a tubular (10).

With regard to claim 22, Buttolph's vanes are integral (see Fig. 5).

With regard to claims 23 and 25, Buttolph shows both the vanes and blades being integral with the sleeve and the bushing, respectively. However, it would have been considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have made the vanes and blades of Buttolph separable and modular, rather than integral, to increase the ease of repair of the device, and because it has been held that constructing a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art. *Nerwin v. Erlichman*, 168 USPQ 177, 179.

With regard to claim 24, Buttolph's blades are integral with the bushing (see Fig. 5).

With regard to claim 26, Buttolph's vanes are parallel to the axis of rotation (see Fig. 5).

With regard to claim 42, Buttolph's blades (51) centralize the sleeve within the wellbore (see Figs. 1-3).

With regard to claim 43, Buttolph discloses the bushing being a solid sleeve, rather than a clamp. However, DeBray et al. disclose the bushing (50) being split and clamped around the sleeve (26).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buttolph in view of DeBray et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Yancey (US 2,794,617).

Buttolph in view of DeBray et al. fails to disclose blades that extend farther than the vanes.

Yancey discloses blades (56) which are rotatable relative to vanes (42), and the blades extend farther than the vanes (see Fig. 2).

It would have been considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have extended the blades of Buttolph past the vanes, as Yancey discloses that this type of configuration was well known in the art and would have yielded predictable results.

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buttolph in view of DeBray et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shizawa (JP62101149).

Buttolph in view of DeBray et al. fails to disclose the blades comprising a notch.

Shizawa discloses a mixing/agitating device having a blade (14) comprising multiple notches (13).

It would have been considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have provided the blades of Buttolph in view of DeBray et al. with notches, as Shizawa states that "turbulences and divisions are generated by the flow caused by respective notches and blades...to mix and agitate the fluids more effectively" (see Shizawa Abstract).

Response to Arguments

The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed June 8, 2011 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1, 35, 36, 44, and 45 based upon Buttolph in view of Debray et al. as set forth in the last Office action because: The arguments presented in the declaration are not persuasive.

The declaration—as well as applicant's remarks—essentially puts forth the argument that Buttolph's device would no longer be able to withstand a jarring force if it were modified to be constructed as a clamp in accordance with the teachings of DeBray et al. Furthermore, Buttolph's device is subjected to much higher loads than the device of DeBray et al., since Debray's stabilizer is attached to a *drill collar*, rather than a standard drill tubular.

Examiner respectfully traverses these arguments. The following documents provide evidence which contradicts applicant's assertions. **Thompson et al. (US 4,275,935)** disclose a drill string stabilizer formed as a clamp and attached to a *drill collar* (see Abstract). Thompson et al. state that their stabilizer is capable of withstanding forces "in the range of 200,000 pounds" and "torques in the range of 60,000 foot pounds" (column 2, lines 4-23). **Krueger et al. (US 5,803,193)** disclose a clamped drill pipe stabilizer (Fig. 3) that maintains the ability "to tolerate impact loads from jarring and other externally applied impact" (column 16, lines 12-18). Given this evidence, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it reasonable to modify the stabilizer of Buttolph to be clamped to the drill collar, and still would have expected the apparatus to be able to withstand the loads experienced during normal drilling, and even during jarring.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT E. FULLER whose telephone number is

(571)272-6300. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 9:00 AM - 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shane Bomar can be reached on 571-272-7026. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/SHANE BOMAR/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3676

06/13/2011
/R.E.F./